

UIR:1521

DD/S - 68-3995  
11/1/5 (28) 344/5

2 August 1968

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Support

SUBJECT : DDP's Proposal to Augment Selection  
Standards for CTP

1. Transmitted herewith is a copy of the DDP's memorandum for the Deputy Director for Support (Attachment 1). This memorandum was sent through me for my concurrence. On 1 August, [ ] who I think was the actual author of the DDP memorandum, pressed me to provide an answer prior to the DDP's departure for annual leave beginning 3 August. I have sent over to [ ] the first seven paragraphs only of Chief/CTP's comments addressed to me, subject: DDP's Proposal to Augment Selection Standards for CTP (Attachment 2). On the transmittal slip to [ ] I noted: "Transmitted herewith are comments on the DDP's proposal from C/CTP. I think there is enough validity in his comments to warrant joint discussion with appropriate DDP representatives before proceeding further."

2. Paragraphs 8 - 11 merit special attention. I have formed no clear opinion as yet on the validity of Chief/CTP's comments in these paragraphs. Certainly, I had not had any previous impression that a number of marginal candidates had been accepted in the program to satisfy the pressures of larger quotas. Naturally, I will go into these problems more fully in the immediate future.

3. Any guidelines you may wish to provide us will be helpful.

John Richardson  
Director of Training

Ans

DTR-1431

**MEMORANDUM FOR:** Deputy Director for Support

**VIA:** Director of Training

**SUBJECT:** Proposal to Augment the Selection Standards for CTs

**REFERENCES:**

- A. Memo for Executive Director-Comptroller from DDP, dated 28 Jan 1965, subject "JOT Input for the CS, FY 1966 and 1967".
- B. Memo for DDP from Executive Director-Comptroller, dated 15 Feb 1965, same subject as reference A.

1. Concurrence to the proposal presented in paragraph 4 of this memorandum is requested.

2. From inter-staff discussions, it is our understanding that the field officers of the Recruitment Division in discussions with general CT applicants speak in broad terms and give no assurances as to assignments to particular directorates or deployments overseas or beginning salaries (only salary ranges). These questions as well as the evaluation of qualifications, beyond the minimum required for initial consideration, are dealt with by the Washington Headquarters. This memorandum deals with this latter aspect of selection and sets forth the method whereby the CS intends to deal with its future professional accessions, depending upon the experience gained in the near term.

3. Under present circumstances, it does not appear that the CS will be under pressure for manpower accretion to fulfill input quotas in the definable future. We have an unusual opportunity, therefore, to accentuate the more discriminative selection factors in our recruitment of Junior Officers. That such a course is and has been desirable is well stated by one

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt

4

6. We ask your concurrence to the proposal set forth above as a precedent step to working out an incisive procedure. We would then seek to institute this proposal in the first instance with respect to the applicants under consideration for the unfilled positions in those classes which will constitute the CT accretion for FY 1970 and 1971.

Thomas H. Karamessines  
Deputy Director for Plans

CONCUR:

Director of Training

Deputy Director for Support

cc: DTR

DTR-1518

2 August 1968

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Training

SUBJECT : DDP's "Proposal to Augment Selection Standards for CTs"

1. This memorandum is submitted in response to your request for comments on the Subject Proposal.

2. It is my considered opinion that this proposal, if implemented, would serve neither the best interests of the Agency nor of the Clandestine Services itself. If the CS is authorized to make independent selection of junior professionals for the Career Training Program, which would be the practical effect of this proposal, other Directorates may well follow suit, and justifiably so. Such fragmentation of the selection process would destroy the admittedly successful formula of this Program, i.e., the integration of careful selection, training, and constant evaluation over many months by professional intelligence officers to assure that a promising individual's talents are identified, developed, and then applied in the type of work to which he or she is best suited, taking into account the Agency's needs as a whole.

3. In our experience, pre-selection of candidates for assignment to a given Directorate, and even more so to a given job, is much less likely to match the man to the job for which he is best suited than is the system which this Program painstakingly has evolved in cooperation with the Directorates. This view is fully shared by the three CS officers who are assigned to the Career Training Staff.

4. Implicit in this proposal is a certain dissatisfaction with the CTP selection process. Yet, for seventeen years, this Program's selection and training techniques have provided the CS with

a generation of junior officers who, in overwhelming percentage, have been judged by their superiors to be highly successful. As noted above, there are three CS officers assigned to this Staff; also assigned to the Staff are three OTR officers who have experience in clandestine field operations. Given articulate guidance by the CS, the CT Staff does an effective job of selecting candidates for the CS as well as for the other Directorates. This Staff has been as discriminating in its selections as CS quotas for CTs have allowed it to be and at this time of reduced quotas is applying criteria which are at least equal to those suggested in DDP's memorandum.

5. This proposal is not without precedent. Seeking more direct CS participation in the CT selection process, the DDP in 1965 directed his division and staff chiefs, their deputies, and other senior officers to take turns in participating daily in CTP interviews at 1000 Glebe. After an experiment which lasted several months, each CS officer left with the conviction that the CTP selection criteria and their application were highly professional in accomplishing CS purposes. Once satisfied, CS enthusiasm for the procedure waned, senior officers became less and less available, and the experiment lapsed.

6. You will recall that last year, after considerable soul-searching and experimentation, the CS CT Selection Board, through its Chairman, concluded that the best time for evaluating a CT candidate for a career in the CS is upon completion of his operational training when a more valid judgment of the candidate's suitability can be made. A very serious risk in the present DDP proposal is that a premature, one-time snap judgment may deny employment to a significant number of applicants who, in the experience of this Staff, reveal within the training cycle a wealth of hitherto latent talent. On the opposite side of the coin, an applicant selected solely by the CS, if subsequently washed out in his quest for an operational career, may not have residual talents for assignment elsewhere in the Agency. One of the more useful tools of the CT Staff is to measure a candidate's possible versatility in terms of the Agency's needs as a whole. This resource would be absent in any CS unilateral selection procedure.

7. There is also a weakness in the proposal arising from a misconception as to the usefulness of the results of Part I of the professional test battery in making selection of candidates. As presently projected,

the results of Part I (field testing) will not be directly relevant in helping to evaluate an applicant's personality, attitudes, political interests, and cultural knowledge -- all of which were cited recently by senior CS officers as among the vital elements a CS "headhunter" should possess. CTP already has objected strongly to the proposed testing plan, as you know, on the grounds that the results of Part II, to be taken at Headquarters, will become available some three weeks following the interviews in which they could have proved most meaningful.

8. One point must be conceded. Beginning in FY 1965, as a result of strong pressures from a number of sources, OTR and CTP were prevailed upon to expand the size of the Program. The CS quota

[REDACTED] 25X1  
were offered all around that this step could be accomplished without an appreciable drop in the caliber of CTs or their training. But the fact of the matter is that from 1965 until the recent cutback in the Program, CTP had to accept a number of marginal candidates in order to satisfy the pressures of larger quotas. Three years' experience with this approach has shown it to be unrealistic and specious. Even before the impact of the BALPA Exercise became apparent, there were indications from all the Directorates that while large CT inputs could be accommodated in terms of budget and ceiling, they could not always be accommodated as in the past, in terms of satisfying jobs or effective on-the-desk development. We are increasingly conscious of the current budgetary limitations on hiring new personnel and have taken steps to accept only the most qualified. My concern now is that we maintain high selection standards if pressures for increased quotas begin anew.

9. Whether or not one infers from DDP's proposal a certain dissatisfaction with the caliber of some of the recently-assigned CTs, the fact remains that CTP cannot operate anything more than a pedestrian personnel and training program when huge numbers are involved. Diminishing returns inevitably set in at some point, in terms of caliber of the candidates accepted. I believe this Program ought to be established on a rational, stable base whose numbers and selection standards do not ebb and flow in relation to the size of the budgetary pie. I believe that the Agency ought to make a clear determination that this Program's

purpose should be to select highly-qualified junior professionals who, while certainly not an elite corps, should have open to them job opportunities commensurate with their ability levels. Such has not always been the case in the last three years and it has not always been the "marginal" CT who has been assigned to the job without challenge.

10. There is not a simplistic answer to this problem for many factors are involved, a fair number of which are prerogatives of components other than OTR. But in our opinion the point of diminishing 25X1 returns has been reached when we endeavor to recruit more than ap-

[REDACTED]

be a selective Program has been eclipsed to a considerable extent because of what seems to be a relatively greater emphasis on budgetary and ceiling projections. Budgetary and other current considerations in the CS obviously are such that for the foreseeable future we will be operating at an even lower level on behalf of that component. Assuming, however, that we are to maintain high selection and training standards, I would hope that any future pressures for operating levels higher than those 25X1 indicated above could be resisted successfully. Even now CTP is convinced that the present quotas for DD/I and DD/S, [REDACTED] are unrealistically high and ought to be reduced.

11. The two dangers specified in this memorandum -- fragmentation of selection and oversized level of operation -- could very easily undermine the expertise and resources developed by this Program over a long period of time and to considerable degree eradicate what even the Bureau of the Budget regards as one of the most effective programs in this Agency.

[REDACTED]  
Chief, Career Training Program

STATINTL